

REMARKS

Claims 12, 13, 18, 21, and 22 have been amended, Claims 8-11, 14-17, and 19-20 have been cancelled without prejudice, and new Claims 24-26 have been added. Claims 12, 13, 18, 21, 22, and 24-26 are pending in the application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

Interview Summary

As an initial matter, the Applicant wishes to express his gratitude for the Examiner's time spent on a phone interview held between Eugene Worley, attorney for Applicant, and the Examiner on January 25, 2007. The purpose of the interview was to discuss the claim objections to claims 8 and 17. During the interview, the Examiner indicated that changing "programming said processor types into said at least one programmable logic device such that said at least one programmable logic is programmed to implement said processor types" to "programming said at least one programmable logic device to implement said processor types" would overcome the claim objections.

Claim Objections

According to the Office Action, claims 8 and 17 were objected to for the following reasons:

First it is not clear the meaning of the term "at least one programmable logic" (is word "device" missed?). Secondly, amended limitation leaves the question open: what was programmed (processor or programmable logic device) to simulate what.

The claim objection to claim 8 will be addressed with respect to claims 12 and 13, which have each been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claims 8. In claims 12 and 13, the language "programming said processor types into said at least one programmable logic device such that said at least one programmable logic is programmed to implement said processor types" from claim 8 has been changed to "programming said at least one programmable logic device to implement said processor types." Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the claim objection to claim 8 be withdrawn.

The claim objection to claim 17 will be addressed with respect to claims 18, 21, and 22, which have each been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claim 17. In claims 18, 21, and 22, the language "programming said logic processors, said at least one macro processor and said at least one memory processor into at least one programmable logic device such that said at least one programmable logic is programmed to implement said logic processors, said at least one macro processor and said at least one memory processor" from claim 17 has been changed to "programming said at least one programmable logic device to implement said logic processors, said at least one macro processor and said at least one memory processor." Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the claim objection to claim 17 be withdrawn.

Claim 18 was objected to for informalities. Applicant has amended claim 18 based on the suggestions provided by the Examiner.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant appreciates the indication that claims 12, 13, 18, 21, and 22 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and after overcoming the aforementioned claim objections.

Claims 12 and 13 have each been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of base claim 8 and claim 9. Claims 18, 21, and 22 have each been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of base claim 17. In addition, claims 12, 13, 18, 21 and 22 have been amended to address the claim objections as discussed above. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 12, 13, 18, 21, and 22 are in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 8-11, 14-17, 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hoare et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 20020133325). These claims have been cancelled, therefore rendering the rejection of these claims moot.

New Claims

New Claims 24-26 are patentable by virtue of their dependency from claim 12.

Conclusion

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that claims 12, 13, 18, 21, 22, and 24-26 are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (949) 567-6700 if

there is any way to expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP

Dated: 2/6/2007

By: Eugene Worley
Eugene Worley
Reg. No. 47,186

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, California 92614-2558
Telephone: (949) 567-6700
Facsimile: (949) 567-6710